

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-50. By the present Response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 21, 37, and 46 and canceled claims 11, 47, and 49 without prejudice. Upon entry of the amendments, claims 1-10, 12-20, 22-46, 48, and 50 will be pending in the present application. In light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected 1-17, 20-31, 33-42, and 44-50 under Section 102 as anticipated by various reference, as discussed further below. Applicant, however, respectfully asserts that the cited references do not disclose all of the features recited in the instant claims.

Anticipation under Section 102 can be found only if a single reference shows exactly what is claimed. *See Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985). For a prior art reference to anticipate under Section 102, every element of the claimed invention must be identically shown in a single reference. *See In re Bond*, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Moreover, the prior art reference also must show the *identical* invention “*in as complete detail as contained in the ... claim*” to support a *prima facie* case of anticipation. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added). Accordingly, Applicant needs only point to a single element not found in the cited reference to demonstrate that the cited reference fails to anticipate the claimed subject matter.

Furthermore, Applicant reminds the Examiner that, during patent examination, the pending claims must be given an interpretation that is *reasonable* and *consistent* with the specification. *See In re Prater*, 162 U.S.P.Q. 541, 550-51 (C.C.P.A. 1969); *see also In re*

Morris, 44 U.S.P.Q.2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *see also* M.P.E.P. §§ 608.01(o) and 2111. Interpretation of the claims must also be consistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach. *See In re Cortright*, 49 U.S.P.Q.2d 1464, 1468 (Fed. Cir. 1999); *see also* M.P.E.P. § 2111. That is, recitations of a claim must be read as they would be interpreted by those of ordinary skill in the art. *See Rexnord Corp. v. Laitram Corp.*, 60 U.S.P.Q.2d 1851, 1854 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *see also* M.P.E.P. § 2111.01. Keeping the foregoing in mind, Applicant respectfully asserts that the instant claims are not anticipated by the cited references and, as such, are patentable and in condition for allowance.

First Rejection Under Section 102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-17, 20-31, 33-42, 44-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by the Hill, III reference (U.S. Patent No.5,646,819; hereinafter the Hill reference). Applicant, however, respectfully asserts that the instant claims, as pending, recite features not disclosed by the Hill reference.

Amended Independent Claim 1 and the Claims Depending Therefrom

Amended independent claim 1 recites “a *personal computer* including a housing having a plurality of computing components disposed therein and *having a wall mount structure* configured to mount the housing on a substantially vertical surface and a display fixedly secured to the housing” (Emphasis added.) Respectfully, Applicant asserts that the Hall reference does not disclose these features.

The Hall reference discloses a *kitchen cabinet* inside of which a “note-type” computer is mounted. *See* Hill, col. 1, ll. 5-8. The kitchen cabinet 10 of the Hall device, which is “a *conventional kitchen cabinet*,” includes a door 26 through which a hole extends 30. *See id.* at col. 1, ll. 65-67; col. 2, ll. 12-15; FIG. 1. Accordingly, by placing the screen of a *pre-assembled and complete* “note-type” computer behind this hole 30, the

Hall reference indicates that the screen would be visible to a person standing in front of the cabinet. However, the Hall reference teaches that the “note-type” computer should be supported with respect to the kitchen cabinet 10 such that it “may be *easily lifted* out of the supports so as to be usable in other locations.” *Id.* at col. 3, ll. 19-21 (emphasis added).

First, Applicant respectfully asserts that the *kitchen cabinet* of the Hall reference cannot be *reasonably interpreted* as the housing recited in the instant claim. As discussed above, the *kitchen cabinet* of Hall merely provides a support structure for an already complete and independent notebook or notepad computer, which includes its own housing. Accordingly, the kitchen cabinet of the Hall reference cannot be considered *part* of a personal computer. Rather, the kitchen cabinet of Hall reference must be viewed as *independent* of the disclosed computer. Indeed, the fact that Hall reference indicates that an installed computer is capable of being *easily lifted* out of the *kitchen cabinet* clearly evidences that the installed computer and kitchen cabinet are *independent* of one another. *See Hall*, col. 3, ll. 19-21.

With the foregoing in mind, Applicant asserts that the Hall reference does not disclose a *personal computer* that includes a *housing* that has a wall mount structure, as recited in the instant claim. Rather, the Hall reference discloses a *conventional* notebook or notepad computer, and the notebook computer relies on the *kitchen cabinet* for support. Accordingly, the housing of the personal computer in the Hall reference does not disclose any semblance of a *wall mount structure*, as recited in the instant claim. Again, the *kitchen cabinet* of the Hall reference is *independent* of the disclosed “note-type” computer and, as such, is not an *included* part of the disclosed notebook computer. Thus, the Hall reference does not disclose the personal computer as recited in the instant claim.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that independent claim 1 and its respective dependent claims are not anticipated by the Hall reference. With the foregoing in mind, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the instant claims.

Amended Independent Claim 21 and the Claims Depending Therefrom

Amended independent claim 21 recites “a *personal computer*, comprising: a *housing comprising* a display, a plurality of computing devices disposed in the housing and *an upright surface mount* configured to mount the housing to a substantially upright surface.” (Emphasis added.) Applicant respectfully asserts that the Hall reference does not disclose these features.

As discussed above, the *kitchen cabinet* of Hall is *independent* of the disclosed notepad or notebook computer. For example, the “note-type” computer of Hall is easily removable from the kitchen cabinet and presents its *own* housing. Thus, the Hall reference does not disclose a personal computer that comprises a housing, which comprises an upright surface mount, as recited in the instant claim. Indeed, the computer of the Hall reference relies on the *independent* kitchen cabinet for support and, as such, does not disclose *a personal computer with an upright surface mount*.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that independent claim 21 and its respective dependent claims are not anticipated by the Hall reference. With the foregoing in mind, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the instant claims.

Amended Independent Claim 37 and the Claims Depending Therefrom

Amended independent claim 37 recites as follows:

A computer system, comprising:

a *personal computer* having a *computer enclosure*,
comprising:
a display screen disposed in the computer enclosure;
a plurality of computing components disposed in the
computer enclosure; and
a *surface mount* configured to mount the computer
enclosure to a wall.

(Emphasis added.) Applicant respectfully asserts that the Hall reference does not disclose these features.

As discussed above, the Hall reference discloses a *kitchen cabinet* that is *independent* of the notebook or notepad computer it supports. Accordingly, the Hall reference does not disclose a personal computer that has a surface mount as recited in the instant claim. Rather, and in contrast to the subject matter of the instant claim, the “note-type” computer of the Hall reference relies on the *independent kitchen cabinet* for support.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that independent claim 37 and its respective dependent claims are not anticipated by the Hall reference. With the foregoing in mind, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the instant claims.

Amended Independent Claim 46 and the Claim Depending Therefrom

Amended independent claim 46 recites as follows:

A space saving method for a computing system,
comprising:
integrating a display assembly with a plurality of
computing components in a *panel enclosure of a personal
computer*, such that the panel enclosure includes a *vertical
surface mount*.

(Emphasis added.) Applicant respectfully asserts that the Hall reference does not disclose these features.

As discussed above, the Hall reference discloses a *kitchen cabinet* that is *independent* of the notebook or notepad computer it supports. Accordingly, the Hall reference does not disclose a panel enclosure of a *personal computer* that includes a *vertical surface mount* as recited in the instant claim. Rather, and in contrast to the subject matter of the instant claim, the “note-type” computer of the Hall reference relies on the *independent kitchen cabinet* for support.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Hall reference does not anticipate independent claim 46 and its respective dependent claims. With the foregoing in mind, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the instant claims.

Second Rejection Under Section 102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-17, 20-31, 33-42, and 44-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by the Chang reference (U.S. Patent No. 5831817). Applicant, however, respectfully asserts that the instant claims, as pending, recite features not disclosed by the Chang reference.

Amended Independent Claim 1 and the Claims Depending Therefrom

As quoted above, amended independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “a display *fixedly* secured to the housing.” (Emphasis added.) Respectfully, Applicant asserts that the Chang reference does not disclose these features.

The Chang reference discloses a computer having a *moveable* liquid crystal display (LCD). *See* Chang, col. 1, ll. 5-9. More specifically, the Chang reference

discloses a computer 100 having a main computer portion 10 and an LCD 16 that is *moveably* attached to the main portion 10 via a mechanical slipping apparatus 19. *See id.* at col. 2, l. 45 to col. 3, l. 7. To facilitate this movement, the LCD 16 and the main computer portion 10 of the Chang reference are *independent* from one another. *See id.* at FIG. 1 (illustrating the LCD 16 and the main computer portion 10 as separate housings). Accordingly, in the device of Chang, the LCD 16 display is disposed in a first housing, and the various computer components (e.g., CD-ROM 14) are disposed in an *independent and separate*, second housing.

Thus, the Chang reference does not disclose a display assembly that is *fixedly secured* to the housing, as recited in the instant claim. Rather, the Chang device is antithetical to the claimed subject matter, because the focus of the Chang device is providing a *moveable* display. *See* Chang, col. 1, ll. 5-9. Indeed, Chang states that “[i]t is a *primary object* of the present invention to provide a computer apparatus having a *moveable* LCD.” *Id.* at col. 1, ll. 57-58. Thus, the Chang reference does not disclose a display that is *fixedly secured* to the housing, as recited in the instant claim.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Chang reference does not anticipate independent claim 1 and its respective dependent claims. With the foregoing in mind, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the instant claims.

Amended Independent Claim 21 and the Claims Depending Therefrom

As quoted above, amended independent claim 21 recites, *inter alia*, “a personal computer, comprising...*a housing comprising a display*, a plurality of computing devices disposed *in the housing*.” (Emphasis added.) Applicant respectfully asserts that the Chang reference does not disclose these features.

As discussed above, the Chang reference discloses a main computer portion 10, which includes various components, such as a CD-ROM 14, that is *separate* from the LCD 16. *See* Chang, FIG. 1. That is, the Chang reference discloses a first housing, which includes a display, that is *separate* from a second housing, which includes the various computer components. Accordingly, the Chang reference does not disclose a single housing that comprises a display *and* that comprises a plurality of computing devices, as recited in the instant claim. Again, the Chang reference, in contrast to the subject matter of the instant claim, discloses a computer having two *separate* housings: one for the display and one for the computer components.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Chang reference does not anticipate independent claim 21 and its respective dependent claims. With the foregoing in mind, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the instant claims.

Amended Independent Claim 37 and the Claims Depending Therefrom

As quoted above, amended independent claim 37 recites, *inter alia*, “a display screen disposed *in the computer enclosure*” and “a plurality of computing components disposed *in the computer enclosure*.” (Emphasis added.) Applicant respectfully asserts that the Chang reference does not disclose these features.

As discussed above, the Chang reference discloses a first housing, which includes a display, that is *separate* from a second housing, which includes the various computer components. Accordingly, the Chang reference does not disclose *a* computer enclosure in which a display and a plurality of computer components are disposed. Rather, and in contrast to the subject matter of the instant claim, the Chang reference discloses a computer having two *separate* housings: one for the display and one for the computer components.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Chang reference does not anticipate independent claim 37 and its respective dependent claims. With the foregoing in mind, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the instant claims.

Amended Independent Claim 46 and the Claims Depending Therefrom

As quoted above, amended independent claim 46 recites, “integrating a *display assembly with a plurality of computing components in a panel enclosure of a personal computer*, such that the panel enclosure includes a vertical surface mount.” (Emphasis added.) Applicant respectfully asserts that the Chang reference does not disclose all of these recited features.

As discussed above, the Chang reference discloses a first housing, which includes a display, that is *separate* from a second housing, which includes the main computer components. Accordingly, the Chang reference does not disclose *integrating* a display assembly with computing components *in a panel enclosure* as recited in the instant claim. Rather, and in contrast to the subject matter of the instant claim, the Chang reference discloses a device in which the display and computing components are *separated* from one another.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Chang reference does not anticipate independent claim 46 and its respective dependent claims. With the foregoing in mind, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the instant claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected dependent claims 19 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of the Hill or Chang reference and the Lochridge

reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,610,798). Additionally, the Examiner rejected dependent claims 18 and 32 as obvious in view of the Hill or Chang reference and the Goodrich reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,375,076). Applicant, however, respectfully asserts that the instant claims, as pending, are patentable over the cited references taken alone or in combination.

As discussed above, the Hill and Chang references do not disclose all of the features recited in the respective independent claims from which the instant claims depend. Moreover, the additional references cited by the Examiner (i.e., the Goodrich and Lochridge references) do not obviate the deficiencies of the Hill and Chang references discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent claims 18, 19, 32, and 43 are patentable not only for their respective dependencies on allowable base claims, but also by virtue of the additional features recited therein.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the instant claims.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims should be in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner believes certain amendments are necessary to clarify the present claims or if the Examiner wishes to resolve any other issues by way of a telephone conference, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Date: July 7, 2004



Manish B. Vyas
Registration No. 54,516
(281) 970-4545

Correspondence Address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
IP Administration
Legal Department, M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400